## APPROVED - NOVEMBER 18, 2014

City of Ecorse, Michigan

Receivership Transition Advisory Board

Meeting Minutes

Tuesday, October 14th, 2014

9:00 a.m.

Ecorse City Hall Council Chambers Albert B Buday Civic Center 3869 West Jefferson Ecorse, Michigan 48229

REPORTED BY:

Nina Lunsford, CER 4539 Modern Court Reporting & Video, LLC SCAO Firm Number 08228 101-A North Lewis Street Saline, Michigan 48176(734) 429-9143

## Called to order at 9:00 a.m. 1 2 MR. KORYZNO: Ecorse Receivership Transition Advisory Board 3 meeting for Tuesday, October 14, 2014, called to order. 4 5 Mr. Van de Grift, roll call? 6 7 Roll Call by Mr. Van de Grift: Robert Bovitz: Here. 8 9 Edward Koryzno: Here. 10 Joyce Parker: Here. 11 MR. VAN de GRIFT: All present. Thank you. Approval of the agenda; I'll 12 MR. KORYZNO: 13 entertain a motion to approve the agenda. 14 MR. BOVITZ: So moved. 15 MS. PARKER: Support. 16 MR. KORYZNO: Moved and supported; any discussion? Seeing none, all in favor of the motion say "aye". 17 18 MR. BOVITZ: Aye. 19 MS. PARKER: Aye. 20 MR. KORYZNO: Aye. MR. KORYZNO: Opposed, same sign. The agenda is approved as 21 22 printed. Next item is approval of the RTAB minutes. entertain a motion to approve the August September 9th 23 12th, 2014 RTAB minutes as presented.

25

MR. BOVITZ:

So moved.

MS. PARKER: Support. 1 MR. KORYZNO: Been moved and supported; any discussion? 2 Seeing none, all in favor of the motion say aye. 3 MR. BOVITZ: Aye. 4 MS. PARKER: Aye. 5 MR. KORYZNO: Aye. 6 Opposed, same sign. The motion is approved. 7 MR. KORYZNO: Old business, there is none, so we'll move on to new business. 8 First item is approval of resolutions and ordinances for city 9 council meetings. Item one, resolutions from regular city council 10 meeting of August 19th, 2014. 11 Motion to accept. 12 MR. BOVITZ: 13 MS. PARKER: Support. MR. KORYZNO: Been moved and supported to approve the 14 resolutions from the August 19th, 2014 city council meeting; is 15 there any discussion? Seeing none, all in favor of the motion say 16 17 aye. MR. BOVITZ: 18 Aye. 19 MS. PARKER: Aye. 20 MR. KORYZNO: Aye. Opposed same sign. Motion is approved. 21 MR. KORYZNO: Item two, resolutions from regular city council meeting of 22 September 2nd, 2014. 23 MR. BOVITZ: Move to accept, with the exception of Resolution 24

of 326.14.

Support. MS. PARKER: 1 Been moved and supported, to accept all except 2 MR. KORYZNO: for Resolution 326.14. Any discussion? Seeing none, all in favor 3 of the motion say aye. 4 5 MR. BOVITZ: Aye. MS. PARKER: Aye. 6 MR. KORYZNO: Aye. 7 MR. KORYZNO: Opposed, same sign. Motion is approved. 8 Resolution 326.14, Mr. Van de Grift, could you please summarize 9 this matter for the Board? 10 This is the first in a MR. VAN de GRIFT: Good morning. 11 series of resolutions before the Board today. It deals with the 12 appointment of a interim city administrator who has since withdrawn 13 his application, and so I would be recommending that it not be 14 15 approved. I'll entertain a motion. Before, are there any 16 MR. KORYZNO: questions for Mr. Van de Grift? 17 Just a question, so, basically with the applicant 18 MS. PARKER: no longer under consideration, is there a need for action on the 19 part of the Board? 20 It might be advisable, There's not a need. MR. VAN de GRIFT: 21 to be in accord with the previous resolutions dealing with Mr. 22 At a previous meeting, his qualifications were reviewed 23 and that was the issue. At this meeting, that's not required. 24

MR. BOVITZ: I think at the last meeting, or was it the day

```
after the special meeting, and so we already knew what had taken
1
   place, and I think we excluded it at the last meeting, so really,
2
   the fact that we've accepted the minutes of that meeting
3
    officially, with the exclusion of that resolution, there's no
4
5 -
    further action, is my understanding.
         MR. KORYZNO: So, what's the Board's pleasure?
6
         MR. BOVITZ: Accept the minutes without the resolution.
7
         MR. KORYZNO: All right, so we won't take any action on this?
8
         MR. BOVITZ: Right. And we've already approved the minutes
9
10
    without that, right?
         MR. KORYZNO: All right. Next item, resolutions from special
11
    city council meeting of September 8th, 2014.
12
         MR. BOVITZ: Move to accept the minutes of September 8th, with
13
    the exception of Resolution 330.14.
14
15
         MS. PARKER:
                      Support.
         MR. KORYZNO: Been moved and supported to accept the
16
    resolutions from the meeting, with the exception of Resolution
17
             Any further discussion? Seeing none, all in favor of the
18
19
    motion, say aye.
20
         MR. BOVITZ:
                      Aye.
         MS. PARKER:
                      Aye.
21
         MR. KORYZNO: Aye.
22
         MR. KORYZNO: Opposed, same sign. The motion is approved.
23
         Resolution 330.14, Mr. Van de Grift?
24
                             This is an identical resolution; I think
25
         MR. VAN de GRIFT:
```

that there should be inaction, for the same reasons just described.

MR. KORYZNO: All right. We'll take no further action on that item, either.

Item four, resolutions from regular city council meeting of September 16th, 2014.

MR. BOVITZ: Move to accept the minutes of September 16th, 2014, with the exception of Resolution 348.14.

MS. PARKER: Support.

.5

- 21

MR. KORYZNO: Been moved and supported to approve the resolutions, with the exceptions of Resolution **348.14**. Further discussion? Seeing none, all in favor of the motion say aye.

MR. BOVITZ: Aye.

MS. PARKER: Aye.

MR. KORYZNO: Aye.

MR. KORYZNO: Opposed same sign. The motion is approved.

Resolution 348.14, Mr. Van de Grift?

MR. VAN de GRIFT: It appears that this resolution was a reaction to the city comptroller delaying payment on a number of invoices for concerns about whether they were proper. The city council adopted a resolution purporting to resolve that all contracts would be paid timely after the work was done. This is an excellent opportunity to note that all invoices and resolutions must be approved by the city council as well, as by the RTAB board, so this resolution appears to be at cross purposes with that vetting method. And so Treasury's recommendation is it not be

```
1
    approved, and that the traditional system for bill approval be
2
    continued.
3
         MR. KORYZNO: Any questions for Mr. Van de Grift from the
4
    Board? If not, I'll entertain a motion.
5
         MR. BOVITZ: Motion to deny Resolution 348.14.
6
         MS. PARKER:
                     Support.
7
         MR. KORYZNO: Been moved and supported to deny Resolution
8
    348.14; any further discussion?
9
         Seeing none, all in favor say aye.
10
         MR. BOVITZ:
                      Aye.
11
         MS. PARKER:
                      Aye.
12
         MR. KORYZNO: Aye.
13
         MR. KORYZNO: Opposed, same sign. The motion is approved.
14
         Item five, claims and accounts from regular city council
15
    meeting draft minutes of September 30, 2014.
16
                      Move to accept the draft of the claims and
         MR. BOVITZ:
17
    accounts from the September 30th meeting.
18
         MS. PARKER:
                      Support.
19
         MR. KORYZNO: Been moved and supported; any further discussion
20
    regarding the claims and accounts from the September 30th, 2014
21
    city council meeting? Seeing none, all in favor of the motion say
22
    aye.
23
         MR. BOVITZ:
                     Aye.
24
         MS. PARKER:
                      Aye.
25
         MR. KORYZNO: Aye.
```

MR. KORYZNO: All opposed, same sign. Motion is approved.

Letter from city attorney, dated October 2nd, 2014, item one, approval of city council minutes, addressed, this item was addressed to new business.

Item two, approval of budget to actual report, Mr. Van de Grift, please summarize this matter for the Board.

MR. VAN de GRIFT: Indeed, I'm simply summarizing the letter Controller, Tim McCurley. An issue of alarm is that the Department of Public Works is over budget for the place in the fiscal year. Indeed, he knows, and I repeat, that at this rate, the DPW will exceed its budget by March of 2015. That's my only comment.

MR. KORYZNO: All right. Thank you. Any questions for Mr. Van de Grift?

MS. PARKER: Mr. Chair, I don't really have a question but I do have a comment, in reference to Mr. McCurley's report, that's included in the packet. Perhaps we can have him elaborate in more detail, but the one comment I have is in reference to the city's two year budget with the Department of Public Works, and various expenses.

Based on at least some of the comments that have come out of our meetings, it appears that the Department of Public Works has really gravitated towards bringing more of the services in-house, which requires additional equipment. And I'd like to perhaps have the city take a look at the operation, to determine why they're

going over the budget.

5.

MR. KORYZNO: So you're interested in specifically isolating the reasons for the increase over the adopted budget?

MS. PARKER: Right. Yes. That's correct, because initially, with the Department of Public Works, the city had in place certain part time positions, and a full time superintendent position.

MR. KORYZNO: Mm-hm.

MS. PARKER: In addition to that, just in terms of equipment, the equipment was somewhat limited, and there was more direction in terms of collaborating with other communities for certain services to be delivered. So if the city is moving in a different direction, the budget that was established for the city may not be adequate, and I think the question is whether there's a need to revisit the process, or bring it back into compliance with what is actually budgeted. So I would like to see that review take place.

MR. KORYZNO: All right.

MR. BOVITZ: And my comment's on the revenue side, since we're two months through the fiscal year, theoretically it was an even budget. There should be a 16 and 2/3 percent through the budget, and there's only four percent. I think that to note that, because none of the revenues from the property tax collections have been recognized; that's about a five million dollar line item. And also, the revenue sharing, the 1.3 million; at what point do we start recognizing revenues from those two sources? And, can we guaran—can we count on the 1.3 million revenue sharing?

MR. Mccurley: Sure, good morning everybody.

MS. PARKER: Good morning.

MR. KORYZNO: Good morning. For the record, could you identify yourself, Mr. McCurley?

MR. McCURLEY: Tim McCurley, the controller.

MR. KORYZNO: Thank you.

MR. McCURLEY: Regarding the revenues, the taxes were paid at the end of July, and by the time they were transferred, it didn't hit until September. So you will see the September report; if I remember right, it's like 60 to 70 percent. So, it did jump up.

Did. In regards to—we've collected the money, that's not a problem. In regards to the state shared revenue, the first payment that's attributable to this fiscal year, we do not receive until November. The first two by the state's timeframe, get put back into June 30th of 2014. So we just don't set up accruals during the year; we just accrue it at year end, basically. So if I was doing accruals as we went along, you would see at least one, if not two, payments from state shared revenues.

MR. BOVITZ: So, as far as revenue estimating, then, does it look like now we're into October, are we going to be at one third of the budget, or, one quarter of the budget through September 30th?

MR. McCURLEY: Yes. Small areas that I'm concerned with, after looking at September's, but nothing major from the revenue side. As for to the expenditure side, which Mr. Van de Grift

reported to you, and we are, we agree, there's issues with the Department of Public Works, as Ms. Parker indicated. It's not just the general funds that you're, that I see, that you would like. It's also water and sewer, because they're inter-related.

MS. PARKER: Right. And, what I recall is, is that you had not included as part of the budget, major purchases related to public works.

MR. McCURLEY: And--right.

MS. PARKER: There were amounts established for various contracts, so, if there was some type of movement towards bringing the services in-house, in total, I would think that there should be some balance with no longer having the contracts, in order to have the revenue to meet those additional expenses. But I'm not sure what the city's doing at this point in time. Can you provide any feedback to us?

MR. Mccurley: As far as purchasing equipment, nothing is being done, as you're aware; no city administrator to lead this program, as far as what direction needs to be going. The mayor has done some things, but, it's a matter of a day to day operation that we need—the city needs direction. Are we going to in—house, outsource it; how are we going to handle it? This part, as far as the DPW, I'm only referring to the general fund part, and that's the part that they've taken trees down; they're—various things that are exceeding the budget.

It's not because the contracts were brought in-house or

anything like that, it's just, you put in 15,000 and they spent 30,000, as an example, so, that's a very large concern that we have. I mean, I've had some sessions with Mr. Wycoff from a legality standpoint and everything on this, so.

MS. PARKER: So it's a matter of oversight?

MR. McCURLEY: Yes, ma'am.

MR. BOVITZ: Outside of public works, though, it looks like the expenditure side is pretty much in check; 16 percent, so it's pretty even. The revenue side, what got my attention there, is when you're looking at nine million dollar budget for general fund, and revenue's only 386,000 for two months. Four percent, that kind of grabbed my attention, so, I'm delving into it just because the revenues weren't booked through August 31st.

MR. McCURLEY: As a whole, the expenditures in general fund are, I see it, like Mr. Bovitz said. I see them being fine; it's just a matter of this one department. But, the budget was adopted on a departmental basis. And this department will go over, if things are not curtailed between now and then. Some of the work, we believe, was done on private property, so that raises a concern, too, so, that's why that statement was made.

MR. KORYZNO: Ms. Parker had indicated, based upon your responses, that she no longer is requesting the report.

MR. McCURLEY: Okay. Good. Thank you.

MR. KORYZNO: Thank you, Mr. McCurley.

```
1
        MR. BOVITZ: Less homework for you.
2
         MR. McCURLEY:
                        Yeah, thank you.
3
         MR. KORYZNO: All right, I'll entertain a motion to approve,
    deny, or table the monthly budget to actual report as submitted.
4
         MR. BOVITZ:
                      Move to accept. Approve.
5
         MS. PARKER:
                      Support.
6
         MR. KORYZNO: Been moved and supported, to approve the monthly
7
    budget to actual report as submitted; any further discussion?
    Seeing none, all in favor of the motion say aye.
8
9
         MR. BOVITZ:
                      Aye.
10
         MS. PARKER:
                      Ave.
11
         MR. KORYZNO:
                     Aye.
12
         MR. KORYZNO:
                     Opposed, same sign. The monthly budget to
13
    actual report is approved.
14
         Item three, approval of refunding of 2002 stabilization bonds.
    This item was addressed in the new business.
15
16
         Item four, approval of letter of engagement for Baird; this
17
    was also addressed in new business.
18
         Item five, approval of letter of engagement for Miller
19
    Canfield, this too was addressed in new business. Item six,
20
    approval of CI Construction contract. Mr. Van de Grift, could you
21
22
23
                        I'm terribly sorry; if I may interrupt, going
```

MR. McCURLEY:

1 back to item number four. Approval --2 MR. KORYZNO: Engagement for Baird? 3 MR. McCURLEY: Correct. When they did the resolution for the 4 stabilization bond, council was supposed to also approve the letter 5. of engagement. Apparently, there was some mix up between what was 6 sent by the city administrator and what was approved by council. 7 It was not approved through your minutes, because it -- we had to 8 send it back to council at a later date, so you had not approved 9 those minutes. 10 MR. KORYZNO: All right. 11 MR. McCURLEY: So we're asking for Baird to be approved 12 separately, to continue on with this process of refunding. 13 it was just a formality that we -- it was missed here, that's it. 14 MR. KORYZNO: Sure. So, the Baird contract was not approved 15 at this particular meeting, where we approved the minutes. 16 you're saying that they were approved at a subsequent meeting? 17 MR. McCURLEY: I believe they were approved at, probably, the 18 September 30th meeting. Or maybe --19 MR. KORYZNO: Which will come before us next month. 20 21 MR. McCURLEY: In November. 22 MR. KORYZNO: Yeah. 23 MR. McCURLEY: Right, and so we're --24 MR. KORYZNO: And so that poses a problem for --25 MR. McCURLEY: Correct. Baird has already been working on it

and, along with Miller Canfield. The city will save money on this, so we were hoping to move forward with this. So yes, it will come before you in November. If the TAB did not approve this resolution, I'm not certain Baird would continue on, or if we'd just have to wait and do the refunding later. I'm not certain about the process; I'm assuming that we would have to refund the bonds later.

MR. KORYZNO: So what's the pleasure of the Board?

MS. PARKER: I would move for the approval of the letter of

engagement for Baird.

5.

MR. BOVITZ: Support.

MR. KORYZNO: Okay, it's been moved and supported to approve a letter of engagement for RW Baird by the City of Ecorse. Any further discussion? Mr. Van de Grift, do you have any comment?

MR. VAN de GRIFT: Just to clarify, this letter of engagement, is this different than the letter of engagement that city council approved on 9/16? I see that the city council resolved, at least, the minutes reflect that they approved a letter of engagement with Baird for \$22,500. Is that for the SRF matter, and not for this matter?

MR. McCURLEY: September 16th, if I'm understanding it, it is for the refunding for Baird. But council wouldn't have approved the minutes until the 30th, so I assume that, based on that, you wouldn't get the minutes for this meeting on a timely manner, so that's why we're making sure we could get it ahead of time.

```
MR. VAN de GRIFT:
                            Got it.
1
         MR. McCURLEY: If I'm wrong, I apologize, then, for bringing
2
3
    this up.
         MR. VAN de GRIFT: Okay, so the minutes from 9/16 were
4
    reviewed today, and I think this resolution was with the -- in the
5.
6
    bulk approvals.
         MR. McCURLEY: Okay. I apologize.
7
8
         MR. KORYZNO: So, additional action is --
         MR. VAN de GRIFT: Unless there's another resolution, or a
9
    different letter of engagement, I think we got this covered.
10
                        It's <del>22 five</del>. #12,500
11
         MR. McCURLEY:
         MR. VAN de GRIFT: Super.
12
         MR. McCURLEY: Okay, yeah, I apologize then.
13
14
    timing.
15
         MR. VAN de GRIFT: No, I appreciate it.
16
         MR. KORYZNO: All right, for the record, do you withdraw the
17
18
    motion?
                      I'll withdraw this motion.
19
         MS. PARKER:
         MR. BOVITZ:
                       I'll withdraw support.
20
                        Al right, thank you.
         MR. KORYZNO:
21
         MS. PARKER: I do have a question for Mr. McCurley. Just in
22
    reference to the refunding of the bonds, I wasn't clear on the net
23
    savings to the city, by doing this? By taking this action, how
24
25
    much money will the city save?
```

MR. McCURLEY: Over the length of the bonds, it's estimated to be about \$200,000. A little bit more. So we're looking at roughly \$20,000 per year, but, I mean, I know that sum is more in one year, but over the length of the bonds, roughly \$200,000.

MS. PARKER: And it's for 20 years?

MR. McCURLEY: Another ten years, basically, yes.

MS. PARKER: Okay, thank you.

MR. KORYZNO: All right, returning back to **item number six**, approval of the CI Construction contract, Mr. Van de Grift?

MR. VAN de GRIFT: The board will recall this matter, this state revolving -- fund, a sewer project. The city has been experiencing flooding issues for some time. It's hoped this project will alleviate that in a marked degree. To that end, Hennessy Contractors is the engineer. Now is the time for a review of the CI Construction contract, to actually build the project.

Despite his initial misgivings, City Attorney Chuck Wycoff -I don't want to speak for him, but, has communicated to me that
despite different concerns with the contract, that he sees this as
in the city's best interests, and this is kind of a singular
opportunity for the financing that is available to do this project.
For the exact same reasons, and the strength of Counselor Wycoff's
recommendation, Treasury also recommends that this project simply
be approved and get underway.

MR. KORYZNO: Any questions for Mr. Van de Grift? Or Mr. Wycoff?

MS. PARKER: No.

MR. KORYZNO: Would you like to speak, Mr. Wycoff?

MR. WYCOFF: Have you ever seen an attorney that didn't want

4 to speak?

MR. BOVITZ: Well you use words like respondent superior and vicarious liability in your letter; that's pretty impressive.

MR. VAN de GRIFT: For the record, identify yourself, Mr. Wycoff.

MR. WYCOFF: Charles Wycoff, city attorney.

MR. KORYZNO: Thank you.

MR. WYCOFF: I think Drew has pretty well outlined my feelings on this contract. There was an extensive period of time, under one of the city administrators, that we were not really involved in the process. The contract, and the process itself, went forward, and there was some confusion relative to whether the contract that was being reviewed had to do with the SFR -- SRF project itself, or a contract as a city engineer, and so on and so forth.

As a result of that, it was unclear what Hennessy's involvement really was, and how it impacted upon the CI contract. After we actually received a copy of the contract, which was after the bids and started going through it, there were a number of concerns raised. One of them was, it was a single bid, and I will share with you the council had the same concern relative to there being a single bid.

However, when we started looking at the timing, and the funding project itself, or the funding for the project itself, it became clear that time was limited, and there was a window of opportunity if we were to get the funding, or at least, that's what was represented to us. When I finished going through all of the contract, I went -- I sat down with Hennessy representatives, went through the entire contract with them, expressed my concerns; some of those have been addressed, some of them cannot be addressed, will not be addressed.

I had sent a letter to Hennessy, asking them to see if there was some way we can alter things enough to save some money; perhaps changing some materials, changing some procedures, things of that nature. I'm not hopeful, but I do believe it is in the best interest of the city that this project go forward. We've had a number of lawsuits relative to flooding in the city. I am informed that this will help some of that issue be resolved, and so, overall, although it's not an ideal situation, could certainly be handled better in the future. I think that we need to go forward, and that was my recommendation.

MR. VAN de GRIFT: Thank you.

MR. KORYZNO: Questions for Mr. Wycoff from the board?

Thank you, Mr. Wycoff.

5.

MR. WYCOFF: Thank you.

MR. BOVITZ: So move that we accept **Resolution 355.14**, from the September 30th city council meeting.

1 MS. PARKER: Support. 2 MR. KORYZNO: Been moved and supported, any further 3 discussion? Seeing none, all in favor of the motion say aye. 4 MR. BOVITZ: Aye. 5 MS. PARKER: Aye. 6 MR. KORYZNO: Aye. 7 MR. KORYZNO: Opposed, same sign. The motion is approved. 8 Item seven, approval of city administrator appointment 9 resolution that was addressed in new business. 10 Item eight, approval of authorization to process checks 11 weekly; this was also addressed in new business. 12 Number nine, late fee payments, informational only; no board 13 action is necessary. 14 Number ten, checks released; this is also informational only 15 and no board action is required. 16 Number eleven, order number 94 recommendation, again, 17 informational only, and no board action is required. 18 That leads us to Item C, Memo to City Council. I'll entertain 19 a motion to adopt and distribute the reviewed memo to mayor and 20 city council, and read it aloud during board comment. 21 MR. BOVITZ: So moved. 22 MS. PARKER: Support. 23 24 MR. KORYZNO: Been moved and supported; any further

discussion? Seeing none, all in favor of the motion say aye.

1 MR. BOVITZ: Aye. 2 MS. PARKER: Aye. 3 MR. KORYZNO: Aye. Opposed, same sign. The motion is approved. 4 MR. KORYZNO: 5. Next item is public comment. ... A reminder that you will have 6 two minutes to speak, during the comm -- public comment period. Mr. Van de Grift will be the timekeeper. 8 MR. MOORE: Thank you. I'm not sure if I should be here in 9 front of this body with this --10 MR. VAN de GRIFT: Excuse me, if you could identify yourself 11 for the record? Mike Moore, Public Safety Director; sorry. 12 MR. MOORE: not sure if I should be in front of this body with this request or 13 14 this statement, but I have a, one of my officers have announced that he's going to retire. It's a Corporal Sassak, is clearing 15 16 his papers for retirement. But my issue is what I want to do, is 17 replace him. And it is not a new hire; what it actually is, is a reclassification, from a, one of the officers from a part time to a 18 19 full time. 20 I'm not sure if this is a hire or reclassification, and my 21 question is, do -- is this something I'm to come before this body 22 to do, or is it something that a certain measure there to do, to 23 reclassify this gentleman?

MR. KORYZNO: We'll address your question during public comment.

24

MR. MOORE: Oh, so we're, we're okay?

2 MR. KORYZNO: I mean, during board comment, rather. I'm 3 sorry.

MR. MOORE: Okay. Thank you.

5.

MR. BOVITZ: You're welcome.

MR. VAN de GRIFT: That concludes public comment.

MR. KORYZNO: All right. Thank you. Next item is board comment; the board had adopted a resolution to be read aloud during this portion, and I'll do so now. The memo's dated October 14th, 2014, it's to the City of Ecorse mayor and council; it's from the City of Ecorse Transition Receivership Advisory Board, and the subject is the City of Ecorse.

(Reading:)

"The Receivership Transition Advisory Board continues to receive troubling reports concerning the operations from both elected and appointed officials within Ecorse city government.

Because of the mayor (sic) and City Council's inability or unwillingness to hire a qualified Interim City Manager, (sic) several negative consequences are beginning to occur. As the mayor and (sic) Council knows, the city (sic) must maintain a full time City Administrator as a critical term of its emergency loan from the State. A failure to do so exposes the City to possible interest rate increases and even to a full acceleration of the loan under state law.

The sustained absence of a City Administrator is also a

violation of Emergency Manager Order 82, an Order the mayor and (sic) Council may wish to review. The Receivership Transition

Advisory Board has been tasked with the (sic) oversight of the City which includes the observance of emergency manager orders, such as EM Order 82. Unfortunately, the mayor and (sic) Council continues to violate several other EM Orders; in addition to the violation of EM Order 82, EM Order 85 is violated by the failure to fill key positions such as the HR director, which incidentally, the mayor and (sic) Council resolved to hire as a term of Plante Moran's grievance letter, and EM Order 94 is violated in several ways, most notably with the mayor and (sic) Council's inability to submit a realistic and balanced 5-year budget.

None of the cost saving measures proposed by previous City

Administrators during the past 8 months has actually happened. As
a result, the City still projects increasing shortfalls in future
years. This month the Receivership Transition Advisory Board
received word that several significant invoices had to be stopped
for payment by the comptroller because concern existed as to
whether public funds were used for private real estate improvement.

The violation of EM Orders, the failure to address foreseeable budget deficits, and alleged misappropriation of public monies do not contribute to Ecorse successfully exiting receivership."

The other item I have to note is that the November board meeting is not the second week of the month, due to Veteran's Day. The next, the November RTAB is scheduled for November 18th, 2014.

1	Mr. Bovitz or Ms. Parker, do you have any comments?
2	MS. PARKER: I do not.
3	MR. KORYZNO: All right, seeing none, I'll entertain a motion
4	to adjourn.
5	MR. BOVITZ: So moved.
6	MS. PARKER: Support.
7	MR. KORYZNO: Moved and supported to adjourn. All in favor of
- 8	the motion, say aye.
9	MR. BOVITZ: Aye.
10	MS. PARKER: Aye. MR. KORYZNO: Aye.
11	MR. KORYZNO: The meeting is officially concluded at 9:31 a.m.
12	*Proceedings conclude*
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	Respectfully submitted, October 20, 2014
19	
20	
21	Nina Lunsford
22	Certified Electronic Reporter